



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

52

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,754	11/21/2001	Darcy J. McCulloch	049681-5003	9659

28089 7590 05/04/2005

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
399 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,754

Applicant(s)

MCCULLOCH, DARCY J.

Examiner

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2-March -2005 has been entered.
2. The amendment filed on 2-March -2005 has been received and entered. Claims 1-37 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-24, 26, and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Musgrove et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,880 B1) in view of Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,986 B1).

As to claim 1, Musgrove et al. discloses a computer-aided method for tracking and storing network-based transactional data, the method comprising:

(a) identifying each user by a user identifier (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 30-44);
(b) storing the user identifiers in a first database (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 30-67);

(c) associating a transaction identifier with a transaction between at least two users having user identifiers (See Musgrove et al. column 11, lines 1-34);

(d) storing the transaction identifier, the user identifiers of the at least two users involved in the transaction, and transactional data relating to the transaction in a second database (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 1-44).

Musgrove et al. does not teach wherein at least some of the transactional data stored in the second database is accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction;

(f) updating the transactional data that is at least partially accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction.

Andrews teaches wherein at least some of the transactional data stored in the second database is accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction (See Andrews column 12, lines 8-49, wherein “enabling users involved in the transaction” reads on “members...and vendors access the system”);

(f) updating the transactional data that is at least partially accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction (See Andrews column 12, lines 21-65, wherein “that is at least partially accessible” reads on “user has authority”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hillegass et al. to include wherein at least some of the transactional data stored in the second database is accessible by each of the at least two users

involved in the transaction; (f) updating the transactional data that is at least partially accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hillegass et al. by the teaching of Andrews to include wherein at least some of the transactional data stored in the second database is accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction; (f) updating the transactional data that is at least partially accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction because it provides for efficient means to track, store, and collect associated transaction information accurately.

As to claims 3, and 26, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the user includes a primary user having one or more sub-users (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 30-67).

As to claim 4, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein storing the user identifiers in the first database further comprises storing one or more user identity information in the first database (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 30-67).

As to claim 5, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the user identifiers and the one or more identity information are stored in the same database record (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 30-67).

As to claim 7, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses comprising providing the transaction identifier to the users involved in the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 30-44).

As to claim 8, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses comprising associating at least one surrogate identifier with the transaction identifier and providing the at least one surrogate identifier to the at least two users involved in the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 21-67, wherein “one surrogate transaction identifier” reads on “second cookie”).

As to claim 9, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the transaction between the at least two users is distinct (See Musgrove et al. column 5, lines 64-67, and see Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 1-44).

As to claims 10, and 12, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the transaction between the at least two users includes transactions having one or more stages (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 20).

As to claim 11, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the transaction between the at least two users is conducted in a network environment (See Musgrove et al. column 9, lines 1-41).

As to claim 13, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the transactional data includes information about the status of the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 1-

41).

As to claim 14, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein storing the transaction identifier, the user identifiers of the users involved in the transaction, and transactional data in the second database includes creating a transaction record in the second database and formatting the transaction record according to the characteristics of the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 1-41).

As to claims 15, and 30, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the characteristics of the transaction include anticipated stages of the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 1-6).

As to claim 16, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses further comprising providing the at least two users access to at least some of the transactional data in a network environment (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 1-41, also see Andrews column 12, lines 8-49, wherein “enabling users involved in the transaction” reads on “members...and vendors access the system”).

As to claim 17, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein providing the transactional data in the network environment includes enabling the users to access the transactional data at a Web site (See Musgrove et al. column 8, lines 16-29).

As to claim 18, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses further comprising providing the transaction identifier to the at least two users and enabling the at least two users to access at least some of the transactional data using the transaction identifier (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 1-29, also see column 8, lines 1-15, and see Andrews column 12, lines 8-49, wherein “enabling users involved in the transaction” reads on “members...and vendors access the system”).

As to claim 19, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein enabling the users to access at least some of the transactional data using the transaction identifier includes enabling the users to access the transactional data in a network environment (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 1-44).

As to claim 20, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses further comprising associating at least one surrogate identifier with the transaction identifier and providing the at least one surrogate identifier to the at least two users, and enabling the at least two users to access at least some of the transactional data using the at least one surrogate transaction identifier (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 21-67, and see Musgrove et al. column 8, lines 1-29, wherein “one surrogate transaction identifier” reads on “second cookie”, also see Andrews column 12, lines 8-49, wherein “enabling users involved in the transaction” reads on “members...and vendors access the system”).

As to claim 21, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein enabling the at least two users involved in the transaction to access at least some of the transactional data using the at least one surrogate transaction identifier includes enabling the users to access the transactional data in a network environment (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 21-67, wherein “one surrogate transaction identifier” reads on “second cookie”).

As to claim 22, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein updating the transactional data includes updating the transactional data during the course of the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 1-41).

As to claim 23, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein updating the transactional data includes storing additional transactional data and changing current transactional data, whereby previously written data is retained (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 45-67).

As to claim 24, Musgrove et al. discloses a computer-aided transaction processing system for documenting transactions conducted in a network environment, the system comprising:

a first database for storing a respective user identifier and identity information for at least two users (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 30-44);

an information processing system for managing a transaction between the at least two users, wherein a transaction identifier is associated with the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 1-44); and

a second database for storing a database record, wherein the database record contains the transaction identifier, user identifiers of the at least two users involved in the transaction, and corresponding transactional data (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 1-44).

Musgrove et al. does not teach wherein at least some of the corresponding transactional data contained in the database record that is stored in the second database is accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction.

Andrews teaches wherein at least some of the corresponding transactional data contained in the database record that is stored in the second database is accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction (See Andrews column 12, lines 8-49, wherein “enabling users involved in the transaction” reads on “members...and vendors access the system”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hillegass et al. to include wherein at least some of the corresponding transactional data contained in the database record that is stored in the second database is accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hillegass et al. by the teaching of Andrews to include wherein at least some of the corresponding transactional data contained in the database record that is stored in the second database is accessible by each of the at least two users involved in the transaction because it provides for efficient means to track, store, and collect associated transaction information accurately.

As to claim 28, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the transactional data includes data from one or more stages of the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 1-67).

As to claim 29, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the database record in the second database is formatted according to the characteristics of the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 21-51).

As to claim 31, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the database record is updated during the course of the transaction (See Musgrove et al. column 7, lines 1-20).

As to claim 32, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the database record is updated by storing additional transactional data, changing transactional data, and voiding transactional data (See Musgrove et al. column 6, lines 45-67).

As to claim 33, Musgrove et al. as modified discloses wherein the at least two users are provided access to at least some of the transactional data stored in the database record (See Musgrove et al. column 3, lines 40-67, and see Musgrove et al. column 4, lines 1-6).

5. Claims 2, 6, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Musgrove et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,880 B1) in view of Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,986 B1), and further in view of Hillegass et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0007351 A1).

As to claims 2, and 25, Musgrove et al. as modified still does not teach wherein each user identifier is unique.

Hillegass et al. teaches wherein each user identifier is unique (See Hillegass et al. page 6, paragraphs 0070).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Musgrove et al. as modified to include wherein each user identifier is unique.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Musgrove et al. as modified by the teaching of Hillegass et al. to include wherein each user identifier is unique because it provides for efficient means to track, store, and collect associated transaction information accurately.

As to claims 6, and 27, Musgrove et al. as modified still does not teach wherein each transaction identifier is unique.

Hillegass et al. teaches wherein each transaction identifier is unique (See Hillegass et al. page 3, paragraphs 0035-0037).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Musgrove et al. as modified to include wherein the transaction is identified by a unique transaction identifier.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Musgrove et al. as modified by the teaching of Hillegass et

al. to include wherein the transaction is identified by a unique transaction identifier because it provides for efficient means to track, store, and collect associated transaction information accurately.

6. Claims 34-35, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillegass et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0007351 A1) in view of Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,986 B1).

As to claims 34, and 36, Hillegass et al. discloses a computer program product comprising computer readable program code for documenting transactions conducted in a network environment (See Hillegass et al. page 6, paragraph 0072), comprising:

computer readable program code means for storing a unique user identifier and identity information for at least two users in a first database (See Hillegass et al. page 6, paragraph 0070);

computer readable program code means for managing transactional data associated with a transaction between the at least two users, wherein the transaction is identified by a unique transaction identifier (See Hillegass et al. page 3, paragraphs 0035-0037);

computer readable program code means for storing the transaction identifier, user identifiers of the at least two users involved in the transaction, and corresponding transactional data in a second database (See Hillegass et al.).

Hillegass et al. does not teach computer readable program code means for enabling users involved in the transaction to access at least some of the transactional data.

Andrews teaches computer readable program code means for enabling users involved in the transaction to access at least some of the transactional data (See Andrews column 12, lines 8-49, wherein “enabling users involved in the transaction” reads on “members...and vendors access the system”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hillegass et al. to include computer readable program code means for enabling users involved in the transaction to access at least some of the transactional data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hillegass et al. by the teaching of Andrews to include computer readable program code means for enabling users involved in the transaction to access at least some of the transactional data because it provides for efficient means to track, store, and collect associated transaction information accurately.

As to claims 35, and 37, Hillegass et al. as modified discloses wherein the computer readable program code means for managing transactional data associated with the transaction between the at least two users includes computer readable program code means for updating the transactional data (See Hillegass et al. page 8, paragraph 0105, also see Hillegass et al. page 9, column 1, lines 51-62).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lai et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 203/0074280 A1) teaches unique transaction identifier associated with unique user identifier.

“PR Newswire. *IBM enhances its imaging system for medical records*, March 10, 1992” teaches two or more people can view the same records across a network concurrently.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5: 30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 571-272-4038. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Neveen Abel-Jalil
April 26, 2005



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER